



Arizona's Accountability System

Dr. Jennifer Fletcher

11.17.2016

Agenda



- Welcome and introduction
- ESSA requirements
- A-F Accountability System Design
- A-F Accountability System Updates



Every Student Succeeds Act

New accountability systems are required to be in place for the 2017-18 school year

Each state must submit a plan describing a single statewide accountability system that includes the following elements:

- 1) Long-term goals and measurements of interim progress
- 2) A minimum of 4 distinct indicators for each school that measure performance for all students and separately for each subgroup of students
- 3) Annual meaningful differentiation of schools
- 4) Identification of schools to implement comprehensive or targeted support

Long-Term Goals



- States are required to establish long-term goals and measurements of interim progress
- Goals must address:
 - Proficiency on state assessments in reading/language arts and math
 - English language proficiency
 - Graduation rates
- Goals must address progress for all students as well as each subgroup
 - Economically disadvantaged
 - Student's from major racial and ethnic groups
 - Children with disabilities
 - English learners
- State's goals for subgroups must take into account the progress needed by subgroups to close achievement and graduation rate gaps

Indicators



Elementary & Middle Schools

- 1) Academic achievement indicator for ELA and math*
- 2) Academic progress for ELA and math
- 3) English language proficiency indicator*
- 4) At least one measure of school quality or student success

High Schools

- 1) Academic achievement indicator for ELA and math*
- 2) English language proficiency indicator*
- 3) Graduation rates
- 4) At least one measure of school quality or student success

*States must measure achievement of 95% of all students, and 95% of all students in each subgroup

Annual Meaningful Differentiation of Schools



Accountability system must:

- Result in a single rating for each school that describes the school's summative performance
- Inform the identification of schools for comprehensive and targeted support
- Place “substantial weight” on the Academic Achievement, Academic Progress, Graduation Rate, and English Language Proficiency indicators
- Demonstrate that performance on the indicator(s) of School Quality or Student Success may not be used to change the identity of schools that would otherwise be identified for targeted support unless the school is making significant progress

Comprehensive & Targeted Support



Schools must be identified in 2017-18 school year and at least every three years subsequently

Comprehensive Support (must include)

- Lowest performing 5% of all schools receiving Title I funds
- High schools failing to graduate 67% or more of its students
- Chronically low-performing subgroup – three years of targeted support

Targeted Support (must include)

- Consistently underperforming subgroup(s) – one or more consistently underperforming subgroups
- At the discretion of the State – schools with testing participation rates less than 95%

Reporting vs Accountability



ESSA requires States and LEAs to publicly report information from the indicators used in the statewide accountability system **as well as additional information**.

Online report cards (both State and LEA) are to be issued annually no later than December 31st, beginning with information from the 2017-18 school year.

Report cards must provide a detailed description of the State's accountability system, including:

- Minimum number of students necessary to be included in subgroups
- Long-term goals and how measurement of interim progress is conducted for all students and each subgroup
- Indicators utilized within the system
- System for differentiating among schools
- Method to identify schools for targeted and comprehensive support as well as exit criteria

Report Cards



- School-level performance on each indicator utilized in the accountability system for all students and disaggregated by subgroups
- Performance of English Language Learners
- High school graduation rates
- Performance of additional subgroups – migrant, homeless, children in foster care, & students with parent who is active duty military
- Percentage of students and each subgroup of students assessed and not assessed in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science
- Per-pupil expenditures
- Postsecondary enrollment (where available)
- Teacher qualifications
- Results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress
- List of schools identified for comprehensive or targeted support

A-F Accountability System Design



State Board of Education

- Owns the accountability system and its design
- Established an A-F Ad Hoc Committee to oversee the design process and make recommendations to the SBE
 - Met 4 times, 2 more (November 30th 9-11 am and December 8th 9-11 am)
- The models designed by the Committee will go to the SBE for final approval
 - The SBE requested of the A-F Ad Hoc Committee have recommendations by the December 19th, 2016 board meeting

Arizona Department of Education

- Our role is to be a liaison
- We provide information on impact data and answer data-specific questions from the Committee and SBE

A-F Accountability System Updates



Cor Framework K-8 Model

DRAFT

Guidance n weight	Indicators	K-8	ESSA
0%	Proficiency, Statewide Assessment	X	X
	Growth, Statewide Assessment	X	
	Proficiency and Growth, English Language Learners	X	
10%	Acceleration / Readiness Measures	X	X

DRAFT

assessments is preferred.

- Multiple criteria/measures are important.
- Multiple indicators are important.
- While conforming to federal and state law, local decision making should be preserved and multiple options available.
- In general, the students shall be the unit of analysis.
- With the use of end of course assessments, no single high stakes exam shall be required.
- The weights or guidance may be altered by the ad hoc committee as potentially approved by the State Board of Education.
- Proficiency shall be the primary criteria.
- One A-F accountability system shall be designed that meets both federal and state requirements.
- A review of the issue of character as a component shall be considered.
- The bottom 25% shall be removed as a separate subgroup and the calculation shall be included as a growth calculation.

A-F Accountability System Updates



Cor Framework 9-12 Model

DRAFT

Guidance on weight	Indicators	9-12	ESSA
40%	Proficiency, Statewide Assessment	X	X
30%	Growth, Statewide Assessment	X	
20%	High School Graduation Rate	X	
15%	College and Career Readiness	X	X
10%	Proficiency and Growth, English Language Learners	X	X

DRAFT

assessments is preferred.

- Proficiency criteria/measures are important.
- Multiple indicators are important.
- While conforming to federal and state law, local decision making should be preserved and multiple options available.
- In general, the students shall be the unit of analysis.
- With the use of end of course assessments, no single high stakes exam shall be required.
- The weights or guidance may be altered by the ad hoc committee as potentially approved by the State Board of Education.
- Proficiency shall be the primary criteria.
- One A-F accountability system shall be designed that meets both federal and state requirements.
- A review of the issue of character as a component shall be considered.
- The bottom 25% shall be removed as a separate subgroup and the calculation shall be included as a growth calculation.



Questions?